

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/759,021	KANEKO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alicia M Harrington	2873	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Alicia M Harrington. (3)_____.

(2) Mr. Josh Povsner. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 04 February 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 4 and 6.

Identification of prior art discussed: none.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Povsner talked with the applicant on behalf of the Examiner to discuss amending the independent claims 1 and 6 to include "from a light projection prism onto" the third reflecting surface because the Examiner believed the claim lacked essential subject matter. Mr. Povsner explained the claim language "an illumination light beam output from the said light projection optical system being reflected on the third plane" was sufficient structure to provide the light is entering the prism. Thus, the claims will not be amended. The Examiner will discuss the claims with her supervisor.